

***Remarks***

Reconsideration of this Application respectfully is requested.

***Status of the application and the claims***

The present Amendment is being filed together with a Request for Continued Examination under 37 C.F.R. 1.114.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 21-90 are pending in the application, with claims 21, 35, 49, 63 and 77 being the independent claims. Claims 1-20 previously were cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter recited therein. Claims 21, 35, 49, 63, 77-80, 83 and 86-89 are amended herein. No new matter has been entered.

***Summary of the Official Action***

In the Official Action mailed July 10, 2007, claims 77-90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101, as allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter, and claims 21-90 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e), as allegedly anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,721,910 (Unger).

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections respectfully are requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 101***

The rejection of claims 77-90 under 35 U.S.C. 101 respectfully is traversed.

In the Official Action the Examiner acknowledges that "Claims 77-90 recite a 'computer implemented device,' " but asserts that "none of the elements of the claimed device are necessarily implemented in hardware. The claimed devices comprise only

logic and are directed to an arrangement of software, per se. Claims 77-99 are therefore rejected as not being tangible."

Applicants respectfully disagree. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the Examiner's characterization of the claims, Applicants have amended independent base claim 77 to recite "a computer implemented device that executes control logic tangibly implemented therein to organize and analyze information." Applicants submit that the amendment obviates the rejection and properly recites statutory subject matter under section 101. Favorable consideration of claims 77-90 and withdrawal of the rejection respectfully are requested.

***Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102***

The rejection of claims 21-90 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) respectfully is traversed. Nevertheless, without conceding the propriety of the rejection, independent claims 21, 35, 49, 63 and 77 have been amended herein to improve their form, to provide consistency in the claim language and thereby to recite more clearly features of the claimed invention. Specifically, the independent claims have been amended to recite the phrase 'group of documents' in its entirety throughout each independent claim. No new matter has been added.

Independent base claim 21 recites:

A method of enabling a user to organize and analyze information, comprising:  
*searching an input first group of documents to output a second group of documents;*

analyzing an input third group of documents according to one or more analytical functions to output a fourth group of documents; and

*selectively iterating* at least one of *the searching* and at least one of the analyzing, wherein each iteration of the searching or the analyzing is performed using as the input one of the second group of documents, the fourth group of documents, or the output of a previous iteration;

*wherein said selectively iterating includes:*

*performing an additional iteration of the searching using the fourth group of documents as input, to output a fifth group of documents.* (emphasis added)

That is, claim 21 recites, *inter alia*, the feature "wherein said selectively iterating includes performing an additional iteration of ***searching the fourth group of documents*** (as the input group of documents) ***to output a fifth group of documents.***

A search process of the claimed invention is described in the present application, e.g., at paragraph nos. [0086] - [0088]. As disclosed therein, the goal of a search process is to identify documents which satisfy a search criteria, and a search process results in a group of documents. That is, searching (search processing) of one group of documents results in a second group of documents that satisfy the search criteria, where the second group of documents includes documents that were identified (resulted from) the search processing of the one (first) group of documents.

In the Official Action, the Examiner states "Unger teaches the step of using 'patent numbers for this set of patents' (i.e., 'the fourth group') as unique identifiers to search and display the full text and associated graphic images (i.e., 'output a fifth group of documents')." (citing column 6, lines 45-55).

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's application of this teaching to the claimed invention. In fact, Applicants submit that the Examiner's characterization of the cited portion of the Unger '910 patent is erroneous and misleading. The cited portion of the Unger '910 patent states:

The dashed line from Stage V to Stage I represents the fact that the data stored in the data base, and all associated analyses of Stages II [through] VI may be used to identify patents and/or technical documents of particular interest for a particular application. The ***patent numbers*** for this set of patents may then be used as ***unique identifiers to electronically link to full text sources of patents*** and display the full text and associated graphic images of the set of patents. ***The electronic full text sources of these patents may be on a CD-ROM, a LAN or on the***

***Internet.*** Unique Identifiers may similarly be used to link to sources of full-text technical or scientific documents. (column 6, lines 48-51, emphasis added; referring to Figure 1)

Applicants submit that there is a fundamental and significant difference between "searching," as disclosed in the application and recited in the claims, and "electronically linking," as disclosed in the Unger '910 patent. In particular, Applicants submit that there is a fundamental and substantial difference between (A) searching one group of documents (a fourth group of documents) to obtain another group of documents (a fifth group of documents), as disclosed and claimed in the present application, and (B) linking unique identifiers from 'data stored in a database' (e.g., patent numbers) with full text sources of patents/text and associated graphic images of documents (e.g., patents) stored outside the database, e.g., on a CD-ROM, a LAN or on the Internet. In the claimed invention (A), a search process using a search criteria is performed on one (fourth) group of documents to obtain another (fifth) group of documents. In the Unger '910 patent process (B), unique identifiers (patent numbers) from data stored in one data base (the data base of the system of the Unger '910 patent including Stages II - VI; see, e.g., Figure 1) are used to electronically link to a group of documents stored in a different data base (e.g., CD-ROM, LAN or Internet) to obtain the full text source of documents corresponding to the unique identifiers (patent numbers). Applicants submit that, in the Unger '910 patent system, the unique identifiers (patent numbers) are not even a search criteria applied to the Unger '910 data base (States II-VI), let alone to a group of documents stored in that data base; rather, the unique identifiers are merely data identified therefrom. Moreover, the unique identifiers are electronically linked to the full text source patents located in Stage I, which is not a group of documents resulting from a prior

iteration (search or analysis process), as disclosed in the present application and recited in claim 21 (see column 5, lines 3-6 and 16-17 of the Unger '910 patent).

For at least the above reasons, Applicants submit that claim 21 is allowable over the cited Unger '910 patent.

Independent claims 35, 49, 63 and 77 recite similar features with respect to a method of organizing and analyzing information (claim 35), a system (claim 49), a computer program product (claim 63) and a computer implemented device (claim 77), respectively, and are believed allowable for the same reasons.

Claims 22-34, 36-48, 50-62, 64-76 and 78-90 depend from claims 21, 35, 49, 63 and 77, respectively, and are believed allowable for the same reasons. Moreover, each of these dependent claims recites additional features in combination with the features recited in respective base independent claim and is believed allowable in its own right. Individual consideration of the dependent claims respectfully is requested.

***Other Matters***

By separate paper filed concurrently herewith, Applicants have submitted an Information Disclosure Statement identifying additional material that may be deemed pertinent to examination of the present application. Applicants believe that the claims are allowable over the identified information/references. However, the Examiner is invited to review these references in their entirety to independently determine their pertinence to the claimed invention.

***Conclusion***

Applicants believe that the present Amendment is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the official action, and submit that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration of the claims and passage to issue of the application at the Examiner's earliest convenience earnestly are solicited.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C.

Christopher Philip Wrist  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 32,078

Date: OCTOBER 31, 2007

1100 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3934  
(202) 371-2600

702645\_1.DOC